

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 are now pending and are amended in the application. Claims 3, 5, 7, and 9 are cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for not being enabled by the specification. With respect to claims 3, 5, 7, and 9, the rejection is rendered moot by cancellation. With respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specification describes a continuous-treatment apparatus and continuous-treatment method for subjecting a surface of an object, targeted for treatments, to continuous, desired plural types of treatments. See e.g., Spec. para [0003]. The specification provides a written description in full, clear, concise, and exact terms to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the claimed apparatuses and methods. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a continuous-treatment apparatus for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device, which is targeted for treatments, to continuous plural types of treatments. Applicants have amended claim 6 to recite a continuous-treatment method for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device, which is targeted for treatments, continuous plural types of treatments. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, including paragraph

[0020]. Claims 2, 4, and 8 depend from either claim 1 or claim 6 and are likewise enabled by the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Grier (U.S. Pat. No. 6,718,216). With respect to claims 3, 5, 7, and 9, the rejection is rendered moot by cancellation. With respect to claims 1, 4, 6, and 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a continuous-treatment apparatus for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device, which is targeted for treatments, to continuous plural types of treatments. Grier is directed to a variable speed automatic car wash and does not disclose an apparatus for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device to continuous plural types of treatments and, thus, does not teach or suggest the continuous-treatment apparatus recited by claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 defines over the prior art. With regard to claim 4, Applicants note that claim 4 depends from claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claim 4 also defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 recites a continuous-treatment method for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device to continuous plural types of treatments. Grier is directed to a variable speed automatic car wash and does not teach or suggest the continuous

treatment method for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device recited by claim 6.

Therefore, claim 6 defines over the prior art. With regard to claim 8, Applicants note that claim 8 depends from claim 6, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claim 8 also defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakamura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,921,148). With respect to claim 5, the rejection is rendered moot by cancellation. With respect to claims 1 and 6, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a continuous-treatment apparatus for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device, which is targeted for treatments, to continuous plural types of treatments. The apparatus comprises a substrate carrier and plural types of treatment units. The substrate is carried by the substrate carrier while the surface targeted for treatments of the substrate is facing downward, and the plural types of treatment units are operated upward to treat the surface of the substrate targeted for treatments. The apparatus is configured to allow excess liquid applied to the surface targeted for treatments, by at least one of the treatment units, to fall away from the surface after being applied to the surface. Nakamura fails to teach each and every limitation of claim 1.

Specifically, Nakamura fails to teach that the substrate is carried by the substrate carrier while the surface targeted for treatments of the substrate is facing downward, or that the plural types of treatment units are operated upward to treat the surface of the

substrate targeted for treatments. As noted by the Examiner, Nakamura fails to indicate that the treatment surface faces downward and that the treatment units are operated upward. Office Action mailed 10/10/2006, p. 7, lines 1-2. The Examiner argues that “[i]n the absence of unexpected results” the orientation chosen would have been obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As recited by claim 1, the apparatus is configured to allow excess liquid applied to the surface targeted for treatments, by at least one of the treatment units, to fall away from the surface after being applied to the surface. The benefits of this configuration are described in detail in the specification. Specifically, para. [0125] describes that excess liquid can be easily removed from the surface so that excess liquid is prevented from remaining on the surface targeted for treatments. In this manner, the liquid has no negative effect on downstream treatments. Specification, para. [0125]. *See also*, Specification, para. [0133] and [0134].

For these reasons, Nakamura fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 recites a continuous-treatment method for subjecting a surface of a substrate for a display device, which is targeted for treatments, to continuous plural types of treatments. The substrate is carried by the substrate carrier while the surface, which is targeted for treatments, is facing downward, and the plural types of treatment units are operated upward to treat the surface, which is targeted for treatments, of the substrate. Excess liquid applied to the surface targeted for treatments, by at least one

of the treatment units, is allowed to fall away from the surface after being applied to the surface. Similar limitations are recited by claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Nakamura fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited by claim 6. Therefore, claim 6 defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grier (U.S. Pat. No. 6,718,216) as applied to Claim 1 above. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claim 2 depends from claim 1, which defines over Grier as discussed above. Therefore, claim 2 also defines over Grier. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,921,148) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Goodwin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,324,155). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claim 2 depends from claim 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claim 2 also defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Nakamura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,921,148) as applied to the appropriate parent claims 1 and 6 above. With respect to claims 3, 7, and 9, the rejection is rendered moot by cancellation. With respect to claims 4 and 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claims 4 and 8 depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, which define over Nakamura as discussed above. Therefore, claims 4 and 8 also define over Nakamura. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan 9, 2007

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/MPD/cn]